REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13-14, 16-17, 19, 20, and 22 are amended and new claim 23 is presented. Claims 2, 5, 12, 15 and 18 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the amended claims and new claim are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-14, 16-17, 19, and 20-23 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Independent claims 1, 4, 7, 11, and 14 are amended to recite, respectively, a collaboration apparatus between information processing systems for allowing a plurality of information processing means including information processing means based on different architectures to collaborate with each other, a system, and a method, using clam 1 as an example, on a collaboration apparatus "being implemented as an object to be operated singly." (See, for example, FIG. 1 and page 11, starting at line 6).

Independent claims 9, 10, and 17, using claim 9 as an example, recite a computer-readable recording medium storing a collaboration program between information processing systems that allows a computer to execute "as an object to be operated singly."

Dependent clams 3, 6, 13, 16, and 19 are amended accordingly.

ITEMS 5, 6, 8, 14-14: REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 7, 9, 11, AND 17 (AND DEPENDENT CLAIMS 3, 13, AND 19) UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER BANAVAR ET AL. (U.S.P. 6,425,016)

Independent claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 17, as amended recite, respectively, a collaboration apparatus between information processing systems for allowing a plurality of information processing means including information processing means based on <u>different</u> architectures to collaborate with each other, a system, a method, a computer-readable recording medium storing a collaboration program, using clam 1 as an example, having on a collaboration apparatus "being implemented as an object to be operated <u>singly</u>." (Emphasis added).

Independent claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 17, as amended, further recite, using claim 1 as an example, "a relating object generating means for referring to the collaboration information of the collaboration information storage means and generating a relating object for transmitting information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means between the role objects, in accordance with a communication method between the information processing means that is a data transmission origin and the information processing means that is a data transmission destination."

PRIMA FACIE OBVIOUSNESS NOT ESTABLISHED

Operating Singly Not Taught by, Or Obvious In View, of Banavar

As provided in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 1981, (CCPA 1974).

Applicants submit that features recited by independent claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 17 including a collaboration apparatus "being implemented as an object to be operated singly" are not taught by Banavar. In fact, Banavar teaches (see, for example, col. 4, lines 9-12):

> (t)he mechanism for interacting with the view objects and transaction objects in the application layer is the inventive Collaboration Manager 70, which is incorporated into the framework level of each local site.

(Emphasis added).

That is, Banavar teaches that a collaboration manager is a library-like entity and requires connection of the Collaboration Manager 70 and processing at an application level.

Relating Object Not Taught By, Or Obvious In View, of Banavar

The Action concedes that Banavar does not teach a relating object. (Action at page 3). However, the Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to "include a relating object because Bladow's teachings would have provided the capability for monitoring the state of the collaboration." (Emphasis added).

However, as recited by claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 17, a relating object is generated for transmitting information (not a monitoring) to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means between the role objects. As provided in MPEP §2144. 04:

> (t)he mere fact that a worker in the art could rearrange the parts of the reference device . . . is not by itself sufficient to support a finding of obviousness. The prior art must provide a motivation . . . without the benefit of appellant's specification, to make the necessary changes in the reference device.

Applicants submit there is no showing of an incentive or motivation to modify Banavar as the Examiner suggests. .

CONCLUSION

Since features recited by claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, and 19 are not taught by the cited art and there is no motivation to modify the art as the Examiner suggests, *prima facie* obviousness is not established and the rejection should withdrawn and claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, and 19 allowed.

ITEMS 9, 12-13, 16-17, AND 20: REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 4, 8, 10, 14, AND 20) (AND DEPENDENT CLAIMS 6, 16, AND 21-22) UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER BANAVAR

Independent claims 4, 8, 10, 14, and 20, all as amended, recite, respectively, a collaboration apparatus between information processing systems for allowing information processing means based on different architectures to collaborate with each other, a system, a method, and a computer-readable recording medium storing a collaboration program, using claim 4 as an example, having a collaboration apparatus between information processing systems for "performing unified management of data managed in duplicate by a plurality of information processing means including information processing means based on different architectures -the apparatus being implemented as an object to be operated singly . . . (and) information identification object generating means for generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means."

PRIMA FACIE OBVIOUSNESS NOT ESTABLISHED

Operating Singly Not Taught by, Or Obvious In View, of Banavar

Applicants submit that features recited by independent claims 4, 8, 10, 14, and 20 including a collaboration apparatus "being implemented as an object to be operated <u>singly</u>" are not taught by Banavar.

Banavar merely teaches (see, for example, col. 4, lines 9-12) a "a Collaboration Manager 70, which is <u>incorporated into</u> the framework level of <u>each</u> local site. (Emphasis added).

Information Identification Objects That Determine Information To Be Stored Not Taught By, Or Obvious In View, of Banavar

Further, Applicants submit that "information identification object generating means for generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means" are not taught by Banavar.

The Examiner contends that Banavar teaches this feature citing Banavar col. 5, lines 50-54. (Action at page 4). However, Banavar, merely teaches (see, for example, col. 5, lines 50-54):

> (f)or a primary association model object, the set of OIDs of the remote association objects which have registered with it are maintained at 303 of FIG. 4A; whereas, for non-primary association objects, location 303 contains only the OID of the primary association object.

That is, Banavar merely teaches an object that manages the relationship between model objects and <u>not</u> generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored

CONCLUSION

Since features recited by claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, and 20-22 are not taught by the cited art, *prima facie* obviousness is not established and the rejection should withdrawn and claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, and 20-22 allowed.

NEW CLAIM

New claim 23 recites a collaboration apparatus between information processing systems for allowing a plurality of information processing means based on different architectures to collaborate with each other, the apparatus being implemented as an object to be operated singly, and comprising " generating a relating object that allows transaction communication to be performed in accordance with a communication method between the two information processing means to be collaborated."

These and other features of claim 23 patentably distinguish over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _March 22, 2005_   By: _Paul W. Bobowiec_
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501